

RECOMMENDED IMPROVEMENTS IN BDCP PROCESS

DRAFT November 28, 2010

1. Provide more realistic schedule with meaningful interim milestones, including time for analysis and iteration of plan components.
2. Improve lead time for reading/reviewing draft products. Provide at least three full business days for review of any draft product prior to discussion.
3. Clarify how/when iteration occurs, including how analyses will be completed and vetted, i.e. seeing a powerpoint on the results of the iteration is not enough. Work hard to specify a process that is open and transparent.
4. Design meaningful independent scientific peer review process into the process at multiple time steps (e.g. scientific/analytic methods, adaptive management, draft plan, draft biological assessment, draft biological opinion).
5. Improve technical integrity of consultant products by:
 - a) Vastly improving the caliber of the biological evaluations that are conducted, including a focus on methods and appropriate vs. inappropriate use of models and screening tools.
 - b) Limiting access of PRE's to early draft technical products (i.e. consultant products should be shared without initial editing).
 - c) Forbidding consultants that are part of current court proceedings against the current Biological Opinions to participate in drafting BDCP products.
6. Improve access of Fishery agencies to modeling consultant. Fishery agencies need to have access and input into modeling scenarios.
 - a) Re-constitute interagency hydrology team. Include fishery agency hydrologists on team.
 - b) Implement a new procedure that if all 3 fish agency BDCP leads agree a scenario should be modeled, that it gets modeled.
7. Ensure that work is done in an interagency process and that five agency leads agree to charter language and tasks that are put to the teams. For example, the Interagency Fish Facilities team needs to be reconstituted and broadened to recommend appropriate performance criteria for screening, predation rates, and fish survival at the five intake facilities.
8. Develop new procedures for elevating and resolving issues, by documenting agreements and disagreements. Use five agency process to help to narrow disagreement on issues, if the issue is difficult to resolve with all PRE's and NGO's at the table. The recent five agency issue paper may provide a useful template.

9. Enhance state-federal collaboration on BDCP by dropping state litigant status on current Biops. DWR's litigant status on the Biops limits effective forward-looking collaboration and communication on how to resolve issues and develop new, improved solutions to Delta operational issues.